

1. Record Nr.	UNINA9910779959103321
Autore	Loue Sana
Titolo	Case studies in forensic epidemiology [[electronic resource] /] / Sana Loue
Pubbl/distr/stampa	New York, : Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, c2002
ISBN	1-4020-0011-1 9789040200115 0-306-47524-3
Edizione	[1st ed. 2002.]
Descrizione fisica	1 online resource (220 p.)
Disciplina	614/.1
Soggetti	Forensic epidemiology Liability (Law) - United States
Lingua di pubblicazione	Inglese
Formato	Materiale a stampa
Livello bibliografico	Monografia
Note generali	Description based upon print version of record.
Nota di bibliografia	Includes bibliographical references and index.
Nota di contenuto	Epidemiology in the Courtroom -- Case Study One -- Case Study Two -- Epidemiology, Legislation, and Rulemaking -- Case Study Three -- Case Study Four -- Law, Epidemiology, and Community Organization and Advocacy -- Case Study Five -- Case Study Six -- Epidemiology, Law, and Social Context -- Case Study Seven -- Case Study Eight.
Sommario/riassunto	Epidemiology has often been defined as the study of the distribution of disease, together with the distribution of factors that may modify that risk of disease. As such, epidemiology has often been reduced to a methodology only, providing a mechanism for the study of disease that is somehow removed, separate and apart from the populations that serve as its focus. Epidemiology, however, is much more than that. The discipline provides a way of perceiving and knowing the world, and of relating to the communities whose health and disease patterns we are trying to understand. As such, its usefulness extends past the construction of questionnaires, the detective work inherent in tracing the source of an infection or the analysis of data. Rather, epidemiology serves as a point of reference and a linkage between various domains of reality: in the courtroom, between a community's injuries and those alleged to be responsible for those violations; between the community striving to effectuate changes to improve its health and environment

and the lawmakers and policymakers whose actions may dictate or control the likelihood of that change; and between “mainstream” populations and those who become or remain marginalized and stigmatized due to disease or perceived disease.
